

deficiency; that when used with soaked oats it would act as a broom sweeping through the intestinal tract and remove the mucous membrane; that its ingredients possessed an antiseptic power which would check and heal necrotic areas; that it would work through the blood stream and intestines; that it possessed a double action; that it would be effective in the prevention of all diseases, ailments, and abnormal conditions of swine; that it would be efficacious in the cure, mitigation, treatment, and prevention of necro; and that it would be efficacious to prevent an anemic tendency in suckling pigs and necrotic conditions in the new pig crop. The article would not be efficacious for the purposes represented.

Gemocco. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the statement "Recommended as an antiseptic to be added to drinking water," the name "*Gemocco*," and the statements containing directions for use displayed upon the label of the article were false and misleading since the name and statements represented and suggested that the article when used as directed would be effective as an internal antiseptic and germicide. The article would not be effective for such purposes.

DISPOSITION: April 22, 1947. A plea of guilty having been entered, the court imposed a fine of \$150, plus costs, on each of the 3 counts of the information.

2193. Misbranding of Remrow Water Wormer and Guardex. U. S. v. Liberty Oil Company, Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$55 and costs. (F. D. C. No. 21449. Sample Nos. 21600-H, 51046-H, 66801-H.)

INFORMATION FILED: February 6, 1947, Southern District of Iowa, against the Liberty Oil Company, Inc., Des Moines, Iowa.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about September 9, 1945, and February 6 and 15, 1946, from the State of Iowa into the States of Nebraska and Minnesota.

PRODUCT: Analysis showed that the *Remrow Water Wormer* was an aqueous solution containing iron, sodium, sulfates, carbonates, calcium, magnesium, potassium, manganese, chloride, and phosphates, but containing no phenothiazine; and that the *Guardex* consisted of an alkaline aqueous suspension of salts of iron, calcium, sodium, magnesium, sulfate, and carbonate, with traces of phosphates, chlorides, potassium, and manganese, but containing no phenothiazine.

LABEL, IN PART: "*Remrow Water Wormer*," or "*Guardex*."

NATURE OF CHARGE: *Remrow Water Wormer*. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the following statements on the jug label were false and misleading: "*Remrow* (Spell it backwards, it spells Wormer) Water Wormer Watch Results For Hogs, Cattle, Sheep, Horses, Poultry and pet Stock. To aid in the removal of Large Round Worms * * * Important: Be sure that livestock and poultry receive no other water while treatment is under way. Do not expect to see whole worms expelled. Action of Water Wormer instead tends to help disintegrate worms and worm eggs in the system. You should see improvement in appetite, assimilation and appearance. If patients tend to become re-infected, repeat treatment in 45 to 60 days when and if needed. Do not feed milk or buttermilk while treating * * * [Directions given for treatment of pigs, cattle, sheep, horses, other livestock, and poultry]." The statements represented, suggested, and created in the mind of the reader the impression that the article would be effective in the removal of worms and worm eggs from hogs, cattle, sheep, horses, goats, poultry, and pet stock, whereas it would not be effective for such purposes.

Guardex. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the following statements on the jug label were false and misleading: "*Guardex* for hogs, Cattle, Sheep, Horses and Poultry Indicated in the Removal of Large Round Worms * * * [Directions for treatment of pigs, sheep, hogs, horses, cattle, and poultry] IMPORTANT: Do not expect to see worms. You should see improvements in appetite, assimilation and appearance before six days are completed. *Guardex* tends to help disintegrate worms and worm eggs in animal system." The statements represented, suggested, and created in the mind of the reader the impression that the article would be effective in the removal of large round worms from hogs, cattle, sheep, horses, and poultry, whereas it would not be effective for such purposes.

DISPOSITION: April 28, 1947. A plea of guilty having been entered on behalf of the defendant, the court imposed a fine of \$55, plus costs.